

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/005,565

Applicant(s)	
---------------------	--

MUNGOVAN ET AL.

Examiner

Carlos Lopez

Art Unit

1731

All Participants:

(1) Carlos Lopez.

(2) Spencer Smith.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 29 September 2003

Time: 10:00am

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

1 and 2

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In order to correct a typing error claim 1, line 19, after "pressure when said blow", the term "tube" was deleted and - - head- - was agreed to be inserted.

In claim 1, line 20-21, after "pressure when said blow", the term "tube" was deleted and - - head- - was agreed to be inserted.

In claim 1 line 17, after "head and the finish", -- of the parison- - was agreed to be inserted.

It was noted to applicat the term "said pressure supply means" lacked antecedent basis in claim 2. Applicant decided to cancel claim 2.